

*

Security Awareness and Education Subcommittee
Personnel Security Committee, IG/CM(P)

* * *

REPORT OF SAES PLANNING MEETING

STAT

AND

STATUS OF PROJECTS AND PLANS

STAT

* * *

June 12, 1987

*

I. PROCEEDINGS:

Below is a summary of discussions and conclusions at the SAES Planning Meeting, 27/28 April 1987. Detailed minutes of the proceedings are also attached.

The Subcommittee met for two days at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The facilities, accommodations and service were truly first-rate and set the stage for a highly productive session.

All member agencies were represented by at least the primary member, with several alternates and others in addition. Particularly welcome were first-time attendees from ISOO (Deputy Director Bob Wells and SAES member Phil Calabrese), recent additions from OPM (Bob Longo and Bob Applegate) and the new member from Air Force (MSGT Nick Davis). Their participation is a reflection of the Subcommittee's broadened perspective and mandate under the SIG(I) structure (no longer limited to intelligence community agencies and SCI programs).

A. STATUS REPORTS. Much of the discussion time [REDACTED] was used for agency-by-agency status reports regarding each of our individual programs. Collectively, these indicated a couple of things -- that there is a lot going on within individual programs which is potentially "shareable" and that more can be done to ensure continuous communication among members throughout the year. Members will make an effort to bring new products to monthly meetings for distribution or demonstration, or they will mail materials to other agencies directly.

B. RESOURCES. Staffing for security education varies widely among member agencies. It seems apparent that, overall, resources are significantly below par, i.e., below what they ought to be to do a thorough job of security training -- or, in the words of the President's Report, to "vigorously implement" the provisions of NSDD-197.

More money is not the only answer to better security education. But any worthwhile answer is going to cost some money.

Specifically, members were agreed that major agencies should have at least one full-time professional assigned to security education program oversight and development. Lamentably this is not universally the case.

Findings such as those of the President's Report and DoD's Stilwell Report have raised expectations of increased funding for security awareness. But significant increases have not materialized so far and there is now concern that the momentum may be diminishing and that the opportunity for attention to this area may have passed.

C. STANDARDS. ISOO Deputy Director Bob Wells outlined the contents of security education standards now before the National Security Council for approval. Spirited discussion followed. Most members (however) found the standards to be constructive and well-conceived.

The Subcommittee agreed that further development of standards or requirements was not a role which we particularly desire to pursue. We believe that the standards already in place -- NSDD-197, the forthcoming ISOO Directive, Appendix C to DCID 1/14, and individual agency directives -- are generally satisfactory.

What security education programs need is not more requirements or standards or policies, but more and better resources, skills and products.

D. THE SEMINAR. We are planning this year's Seminar for November and have requested accommodations once again at the FBI Academy, Quantico. Our FBI member expects that the Academy will be able to have us; a definite answer should be given in July (several alternative sites have been considered as fall-backs). The FBI facilities are ideal but oversubscribed, and we have now made arrangements for siting of future Seminars (FY88 and beyond) at an Intelligence Community facility where long-term accommodations can be assured.

At the [] meeting members discussed past Seminars, their successes and shortcomings and general goals for the 1987 Seminar. A Working Group, headed by Executive Secretary and Navy member Peg Fiehtner, was appointed to draft the agenda and make the other preparations for the Seminar.

More emphasis upon methodology: Most members believe that briefing skills and other training techniques are in need of improvement within their organizations. Members agreed that this year's course should concentrate more heavily upon training methodology. While this will require some sacrifice of sessions on security subject-matter (threat, COMSEC, TSCM, etc), we feel that training skills and techniques are the essential subject matter of the Seminar and should have additional emphasis.

Accordingly the Working Group plans to organize the Seminar around three major training approaches: oral briefings, printed publications and audiovisual aids. At least one day will be spent on each of these areas.

* * *

STAT

II. PLANS

In response to PSC tasking reviewed in the cover memorandum, the Subcommittee proposes to address three critical needs which are applicable to all security education programs:

- (A) Skills (training the trainers)
- (B) Products (making the most of what's already "out there")
- (C) Production (producing new materials where needed)

A. SKILLS.

1. Short-term. Our main contribution here has been the Security Educator's Seminar (as discussed in Part I, above). We plan to continue sponsoring the Seminar, with perhaps some change of focus (see below).

2. For the Future. The Seminar for training security trainers has been very well-received and is clearly responsive to a major need. But it cannot accommodate anywhere near the numbers of trainers who ought to be trained -- even in government programs alone, to say nothing of industry. Basic training instruction should probably not be handled by the Subcommittee but rather by an established training institution. If such a basic program were available, the SAES Seminar could be used more appropriately for advanced methods and management workshops designed for personnel from agency headquarters and major commands/bureaus/divisions.

Several members have voiced interest and support for a proposal under development at DoDSI which envisions a "pyramid" approach to training trainers. This has been done successfully in certain agencies already (e.g., the IRS). Under this concept, master instructors from major activities would be taught to run their own 3-5 day training methods seminars. A draft curriculum for such a program will be presented to participants in this year's Seminar, for their comment and recommendations.

B. PRODUCTS:

1. What we're up against. There are a great many training products, resources and services currently in existence which are potentially useful to many or most government and industry programs. But are there enough products in existence on all relevant subjects and in all applicable media? And are all the products readily available to all the trainers? The answers are, respectively, probably not and certainly not.

When existing products are not readily available, there are at least two common reasons why not: (a) communications (users don't know about the products) and (b) logistics (producers don't have the resources and/or motivation to provide enough copies at acceptable cost through convenient ordering and delivery arrangements).

The problem here -- and the same applies to skills training and for that matter anything to do with security training on a government-and-industry-wide basis -- is a matter of scale, the sheer numbers of products and users, as

well as the organizational complexity of dealing with all government departments and tens of thousands of private companies.

Solutions will require some departures from the informal person-to-person networking which may have sufficed when SAES was strictly an intelligence community organ. We need "industrial strength" delivery systems. That means more attention to publishing information for mass dissemination and to arrangements for mass distribution of products.

2. Communications: Of the two problems identified above, communications and logistics, communications is the easier to handle. It is here that our most immediate efforts should be concentrated. The Subcommittee plans to work toward two goals:

- (a) a comprehensive data base of products and services.
- (b) a comprehensive data base of users.

The products/services data base will consist, at least at the outset, of a series of catalogs or listings. Ultimately, it should be unified and automated. Its primary function will be to inform users about available training resources. It will also help the Subcommittee (and anyone else who's interested) to analyze the coverage of existing products and identify needs for new products.

Initial steps by the Subcommittee toward the products/services data base will include:

- Production of a SAES members' handbook including listings of limited products held by each member (films, etc. in "private stock," not available for general distribution, due to limited quantities, copyright, SCI caveats, etc.). This should be ready during the summer.

- Input by members to DoDSI's "Training Aids for Security Education," a listing of films and publications (those which are available for general distribution within the cleared community). An update of "Training Aids" reflecting available SAES input will be printed in July.

- Development of a speakers list, with the possibility of establishing a permanent Speakers Bureau to assist trainers in putting programs together. A working group has been appointed to explore this concept. Geographic scope, arrangements for input and maintenance and scope of distribution have yet to be determined, but distribution of a listing should be possible by August.

Other possible catalogs or listings include professional organizations of interest to security trainers and formal training courses available from government, academic and commercial sources. DoDSI is working on compiling some of this; an article on security organizations will be completed for the Security Awareness Bulletin in about August.

The user data base is not yet under active development and hasn't really been thoroughly discussed by the Subcommittee. But the concept provides a way, probably the only effective way, of communicating with security trainers about available training resources -- and of soliciting feedback through

occasional surveys of preferences or needs. Policy guidance and direction would continue to flow through the chain of command, but this has proved to be a tenuous way of communicating practical training information.

The data base would consist primarily of an automated mailing list of security managers within all participating agencies and firms, although it could also include descriptive data about individual facilities which would permit selective mail-outs or solicitations.

The Subcommittee will report further on this concept, before the end of this Fiscal Year.

3. Logistics: Examples abound of good products which are hard to get because delivery systems can't handle the demand or because ordering systems discourage demand.

NATO's film "Something of Value," for instance, is a perennial favorite; it's short, catchy and carries a timeless message. But in order to obtain it you have to write to NATO Headquarters in Brussels, via the U.S. Mission, for authorization to buy it and then write to the vendor in England to make the purchase. With lost correspondence, price changes and the normal complexities of procurement, it took us at DSI two years to obtain copies. (We plan to recommend that NATO make products available through a U.S. vendor or outlet.)

Often the burden of copying, packaging and mailing materials overwhelms an otherwise eager provider. For instance, Lockheed has recently stopped sending copies of its videotapes to other contractors because of staff cutbacks. (We may be able to obtain copies for loan through DIS Regional offices. There are eight of these across the country and they are perhaps the best source of films for DoD contractors.)

Government distribution centers which can handle the load are not always as effective or efficient as customers expect. For instance, ISOO has recently withdrawn its Information Security Briefing from distribution by GSA's National Audiovisual Center because of poor quality prints. (They are now working on an alternative marketing plan for the updated briefing.) Users are sometimes discouraged from using DoD military AV ordering channels due to procedures and delays.

Commercial outlets generally provide good service and sell products at the going rates. But the range of commercially-available security training products is very limited.

We don't have a "global" answer to the logistical problem, and it's difficult to conceive of one -- short of building a facility specifically dedicated to distributing security training materials (which, even if feasible, wouldn't necessarily work any better than present facilities). At present it comes down to working with producers and distributors, case-by-case and product-by-product, to maximize the number of available items and to streamline ordering procedures where possible.

The following actions currently underway by the Subcommittee and certain individual agencies will help to attack the problem:

- ISOO's marketing plan for its updated videotape will indicate new possibilities and/or confirm established limitations.

- DoDSI has recently conducted a survey of readers of the Security Awareness Bulletin on questions to do with the procurement and use of AV training aids. Returns (now being entered and analyzed) will help to indicate the extent of logistical difficulties.

- When the Subcommittee has compiled its handbook section on "private stock" items, we will seek to arrange adoption of suitable products by general distribution outlets.

C. PRODUCTION: The Subcommittee is anxious to promote introduction of new training aids and training services where there are needs which currently available items do not meet. But this initiative must logically follow the efforts described above to make the most of existing products. We must have a comprehensive inventory of what's already out there, and we must be satisfied that there are mechanisms for distributing whatever we produce.

Given these accomplishments we can proceed to identify gaps in subject matter coverage within the current inventory, to determine the topics of highest priority and greatest common interest and to seek ways of funding and accomplishing production.

We have not arrived at a timetable for this process. And we are not yet certain exactly what the Subcommittee's role in the production process should be. Should we be the designers and prime movers, pooling resources and overseeing production? If so through what production facility or contracting activity? Or should we simply identify needs and encourage individual member agencies to do the production as services of common concern? Should the government fund production in all cases or can we encourage commercial activities to invest in this market?

We will pursue these questions and submit plans and/or recommendations as soon as possible.

Submitted:

JOHN T. MILLER
Chairman, SAES